

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-25 and 29-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Hartsog and Becker. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As the Examiner notes, Brooks describes a system for rating the security of a facility. Brooks further describes that each component of the facility is assigned a security value that reflects the security level that is deemed appropriate for that component. Each component is also assigned a security rating that reflects its current security level. An overall rating for the facility can be generated from the security values and security rating of the components. For example, "a simple rating which consists of the sum of the products of the security values and the security rating for each component of the facility." (Brooks, para. 0032.)

Brooks, however, neither teaches nor suggests "providing rules for determining . . . whether a building complies with security requirements" and "applying the provided rules" as recited, for example, by claim 1. Rather, Brooks simply suggests that the user can input a security value and a security rating for each component, and the system can calculate an overall rating for the facility by multiplying the values by the ratings.

Because of this deficiency in Brooks, the Examiner turns to Hartsog. Hartsog describes a system that evaluates whether a development plan meets standards. Hartsog mentions security relating to the development plan as "Building Security Systems: locks, bars, lights" (Hartsog, 16:7), and "an accessories subroutine 384, which evaluates fences, sidewalks and security systems." (Hartsog, 25:35-36.)

Like Brooks, Hartsog, however, does not teach or suggest anything related to describing "providing rules for determining . . . whether a building complies with security requirements." Moreover, the Examiner has failed to point to what in Brooks or Hartsog he believes corresponds to "rules for determining . . . whether a building complies with

security requirements." Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out what in Brooks and Hartsog corresponds to such "rules for determining."

It is difficult to understand the Examiner's rationale for rejecting the claims because the Examiner uses terms that are not used by the application or the cited references. For example, the Examiner states that "providing criteria for determining, based on the provided information, whether a building belongs to a particular security requirements rating" citing Figure 1 of Brooks. (Office Action, Oct. 13, 2004, p. 2.) Brooks, however, does not use the term "criteria" or "security requirements rating." As another example, the Examiner states that Hartsog discloses comparison of "security attributes to standards." (Id., p. 3.) Applicant can find no mention of security attributes in Hartsog. Applicant respectfully requests clarification as to how these terms relate to the terminology of the application or the cited references.

Based upon these remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: January 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants